

**IDRC-Partners @ WUF 2006:
6 Months After**

Tracer Study

**Prepared by:
Luc Mougéot
Megan Bradley**

Special Initiatives Division

February 2007

File 102631-002

Table of contents

	Page Number
Executive Summary	3
Introduction and methodology	4
Outcomes of IDRC's engagement in WUF 3	5
Reflections and suggestions on the WUF planning process	7
Participation in WUF 4	8
Annex 1: WUF tracer study interview questions	10
Annex 2: Notes from WUF tracer study interviews	11

Executive Summary

This tracer study was conducted six months after the Third World Urban Forum (WUF 3), which took place in Vancouver from 19-23 June 2006. The tracer study aimed to document the outcomes of IDRC's extensive engagement in the Forum. It also aimed to gather advice and candid input from IDRC's partners on potential roles the Centre would play at WUF 4 in Nanjing, bearing in mind that IDRC's participation in Nanjing will be more modest than it was in Vancouver. The tracer study was carried out through 30-minute telephone interviews with the session leaders who convened the networking events sponsored by IDRC at WUF 3. In many cases it was difficult to attribute post-WUF developments directly to the partners' participation in the Forum. However, **all of the session leaders reported** that, over the six-month period following WUF 3, **positive outcomes** had resulted from their participation in Vancouver. These outcomes benefited session leaders and speakers as individuals (**professional development**) and/or their organizations (**institutional development**). Outcomes included:

- Ongoing discussions with new contacts made at WUF, which may lead to more concrete partnerships.
- Presentations made in various local venues on WUF, and the integration of material from WUF 3 into university courses.
- The submission of a proposal on urban agriculture to the European Union by a group including two of IDRC's WUF partners.
- The development of new projects involving WUF participants including RUAF, the Environmental Youth Alliance, the City of Montreal, and the Federation of Canadian Municipalities.

Suggestions for IDRC's role in WUF 4 included:

- Beyond its role as a funder, IDRC should participate in a WUF 4 organizing/coordinating committee in order to share its experience in navigating UN-Habitat channels.
- Continue to place emphasis on facilitating networking opportunities for IDRC partners.
- Continue to demonstrate concerted and innovative support for multi-stakeholder processes.
- Help incorporate UA into events with broader themes, such as youth integration and slum upgrading. At the same time, IDRC could still beneficially support UA-specific activities such as a donor roundtable and a UA tour of Nanjing.

Introduction and methodology

Background: The Third World Urban Forum (WUF 3) was convened by UN-Habitat in Vancouver from 19-23 June 2006. IDRC's extensive engagement in WUF 3 is detailed in the Final Report of the IDRC-Partners @ WUF 2006 program, submitted in October 2006. The monitoring and evaluation plan developed by IDRC's WUF Coordinating Unit in advance of the Forum indicated that its members would carry out a tracer study, six months after the Forum.

Objectives: The tracer study aimed:

- (i) to document any outcomes which may have developed for selected partners over the period elapsed since the WUF as a result, partly or largely, of their participation at the WUF.

These outcomes may be documented in terms of exchanges of information with new or renewed contacts; and discussion of, or commitment to, specific proposals, projects or programs. They also may come in the form of new directions for research and programming or policy influence.

- (ii) to gather information on how IDRC's partners would like to participate in WUF 4 in Nanjing, as well as advice and candid input on potential roles for IDRC at the next WUF.

Timetable: The tracer study was carried out through telephone interviews of approximately 30 minutes conducted by Luc Mougeot and Megan Bradley with the Session Leaders (SLs) of IDRC's five networking events at WUF 3. The interviews were conducted on January 31 and February 2, 2007 with the following individuals:

- Jose Ballesteros (Ministry of Environment, Housing and Territorial Development, Bogotá)
- Henk de Zeeuw (ETC Netherlands/RUAF)
- Marielle Dubelling (ETC Netherlands/RUAF)
- Alice Hovorka (University of Guelph)
- Eduardo Passalacqua (Urban Governance Specialist, Buenos Aires)

Questions and forewarning: The interview questions were formulated in consultation with UPE (Mark Redwood) and circulated to the SLs two weeks in advance of the telephone interviews. The questions are listed in **Annex 1**. Although the questions emphasised those outcomes experienced by the session leaders themselves, the session leaders were also asked to comment, to the best of their knowledge, on outcomes experienced by their speakers as well. Various SLs sought out input from the speakers on their WUF panel in advance of the interviews, and two SLs submitted written comments prior to the telephone interview. During the interviews the interviewer stressed that IDRC has not yet confirmed the approach or focus of its involvement in WUF 4. However, both the questions and the interviews underlined that IDRC's engagement in

WUF 4 in Nanjing will be much more modest than it was in Vancouver. This approach, already expressed toward the end of WUF 3, was received as both expectable and reasonable and was not questioned or resisted by any of the interviewees.

Outcomes of IDRC's engagement in WUF 3

All of the session leaders reported that, over the six-month period following WUF 3, **positive outcomes** had resulted from their participation in Vancouver.

These outcomes benefited session leaders and speakers as individuals (**professional development**) and/or their organizations (**institutional development**). Positive outcomes were achieved by session leaders and speakers, either through their interactions with individuals or organizations outside of their own (external interaction), and/or through promoting the new approaches they learned about at WUF within their own organization (internal interaction). These outcomes varied in degrees (**interest, engagement, commitment**) as will be seen from the examples featured below.

In many cases it was difficult to attribute post-WUF developments directly to the partners' participation in the Forum. For many partners, WUF was an important plank in their ongoing program of work. By providing a venue for information exchange and the renewal of contacts with diverse organizations, the Forum strengthened our partners' ability to proceed with work that often had its genesis before WUF 3.

Although difficult to quantify, **WUF also played an important role in reaffirming cities' leadership on UA issues, and gave a political boost for further work.** For example, when Vancouver Councillor Peter Ladner opened a recent conference on food security, he highlighted Vancouver's participation in the WUF. His comments demonstrated that cities are proud to have been selected to showcase their experiences at the WUF. Given the meagre record of local government involvement in UA, WUF had an important function in terms of affirming the value of this work.

In addition to the professional and institutional developments featured below, all of the team leaders and many of the speakers on their panels have been keeping in touch with various new contacts made at WUF. Such ongoing communications could lead to more partnerships and/or advance projects that are currently at an embryonic stage.

The session leaders reported on various examples of personal *professional development* that arose out of WUF 3, either for themselves or their speakers, including:

- At WUF, members of the International Women's Rights Project at UBC approached Dr. Alice Hovorka. Through ensuing discussions, they **agreed to collaborate** with one of Alice's MA students working on urban violence in Botswana. A student who attended the panel which Alice convened for the Earth Festival has also approached Alice to **express interest in working on one of her projects** in Botswana/Southern Africa.

- Eduardo Passalacqua has given a number of **presentations/papers** about WUF since returning from Vancouver to Buenos Aires. Politically, the most important audience he has had is the **Ways and Means Committee of the Legislature of Buenos Aires**. The Committee members were **very interested** in his discussion of the origins and contemporary focus of the WUF, and Eduardo passed on information and contact details he gathered in Vancouver for the committee members to follow up. Eduardo has also **incorporated information and “know-how”** he gained at WUF 3 into his research and **into two courses** he teaches in Buenos Aires.

Beyond positive outcomes on the individual level, WUF contributed to or catalyzed several positive *institutional developments*. For example:

- In the field of urban agriculture (UA), the WUF **enhanced the reputation of the Foundation of Resources Centres on Urban Agriculture and Food Security (RUAF Foundation)**. For instance, following WUF, the **number of visitors to the RUAF website** increased substantially, and the **number of subscribers to the English version of UA Magazine** has increased by over 20%. ETC/RUAF are developing more in-depth relationships with several contacts made or advanced at WUF 3. These include:
 - **RUAF/ETC and the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) are discussing** the possibility of **co-organizing project** in the Great Lakes region (DRC, Rwanda, Burundi), which the FCM can hopefully support financially. The project will address a range of themes including food security, income generation and the reintegration of displaced groups in post-conflict contexts. The project will build on programs that are already in place in the DRC, such as a UA stakeholder forum. RUAF hopes to bring cities together and help them draft a regional program. In one or two years, they will hopefully join the RUAF network. Through contacts with FCM, RUAF **hopes to be able to invite** Canadian city representatives to a workshop on UA in the Great Lakes region, with the goal of promoting exchange of experience between regions. For example, Vancouver would contribute its vision of sustainably integrating UA into urban policy, while Montreal could share its experiences with urban community gardens.
 - Heifer International: RUAF is involved in **ongoing discussions** on project development and food policy analysis with Heifer Project International (HPI) in Washington, DC. **Contacts are also being developed** between HPI and RUAF partners in Bulawayo, Zimbabwe.
 - City of Montreal/Edible Landscapes Team: McGill and RUAF have **contributed to the development of a proposal** which was recently submitted to the European Union for funding.
 - Environmental Youth Alliance (EYA): RUAF is **in discussions with** the EYA on UA and youth. These discussions have been particularly useful for RUAF on the methodological level. RUAF hopes to carry out a larger project on the inclusion of youth in UA, and thinks that youth issues could be an important entry point for future WUFs.

- RUAF also **remains involved in the development of a distance learning course** on UA through Ryerson University, and supports City Farmer's web site by providing new information for distribution, etc. (Note: RUAF and Ryerson **have been drafting the concept**, in consultation with UPE/ENRM and CP/SID in recent months). Participating at WUF 3 enabled RUAF to renew its relationship with these organizations/initiatives.
- RUAF partners such as George Matovu (Municipal Development Partnerships for Eastern and Southern Africa – MDP-ESA) **have been receiving greater attention** from international NGOs since participating in WUF.
- Following discussions with IDRC-supported UA experts at WUF (Marielle Dubbelling), José Ballesteros **has taken steps to incorporate** UA as a risk management strategy **in national policy** on delivery of public services in Colombia. In Colombia's Department of Environment /Land Development Branch, his team has **commissioned a consultancy** (by Omar Dario and Gustavo Wilches, both from the IDRC-supported LA RED network) to explore the use of UA in high-risk areas, particularly those from which populations need to be resettled. A **pilot project** is scheduled for 2007 in Manizales.
- The participation of the mayor of Santo André (Sao Paulo, Brazil) at WUF **strengthened this mayor's role** as a main stakeholder in the Mercociudades network. WUF also provided a push for Alberto Kleinman **to increase his participation** in the Mercociudades network.

Reflections and suggestions on the WUF planning process

We asked the session leaders to reflect on the utility of the preparatory process IDRC supported in advance of WUF 3. The team leaders suggested that the following elements were particularly important aspects of the preparatory process:

- **Team-building and opportunities for exchange amongst panellists.** (For example, all four cities in the UA panel led by Marielle Dubbelling have incorporated aspects of one another's work into their own programs. This **cross-fertilization** would not have happened if the city representatives had only met once, in Vancouver.)
- **Identification of common agendas and key messages** to guide each panel.
- **Training to improve individual capacity to prepare and give presentations.** (The improvement in public speaking skills is still evident in those panellists who have given presentations after WUF. The "dry-runs" were particularly crucial, along with the practice of using video critiques. This practice has been taken up by RUAF members responsible for running "training trainers" workshops.)
- An important aspect of the preparations was that **the checklist provided for the presentations themselves**, a process which forced the Latin American participants to summarize and emphasize their key points, so they could avoid running on in their presentations. It is essential that the preparation processes help people get to the point, and talk about realities.

In terms of planning for WUF 4, the team leaders made the following suggestions:

- **Ensure that at least one preparatory meeting is convened**, and that **public speaking training opportunities are made available** to the participants. However, efforts should be made to limit the material panellists are required to prepare in advance of the training session, in order to avoid prolonging the editing process as key messages are defined and refined.
- **Ensure that the audience and effective communication approaches are kept first in mind** throughout the WUF preparatory process.
- **Hold the preparatory workshop somewhat closer to the WUF**, in order to allow presenters to include information on recent developments in their presentations without needing to go through extensive revisions.

Participation in WUF 4

Individual and organizational plans

All of the session leaders indicated that they hope to participate in WUF 4, and **various partners are already actively considering the different routes available** to them for participation. For example, ETC/RUAF wants to continue pursuing UA on the WUF agenda. From this point of view, in Nanjing it would be helpful to continue showcasing UA, but also to incorporate UA into events (networking sessions, dialogues, etc.) on broader themes such as slum upgrading, youth issues, etc. RUAF may also use WUF 4 as a “showcasing” opportunity, depending on how the current phase of the RUAF project evolves.

Dr. Alice Hovorka is **considering encouraging Guelph University to engage in WUF 4 as part of the university’s commitment to internationalism**, and as an opportunity to promote action-oriented research. Dr. Hovorka is also involved in a CIDA Tier 1 grant (3 m CAD over 5 years) related to capacity building and training — she is part of a large collaborative team involving 5 Canadian and 9 Southern African universities, led by Queen’s University and the University of Cape Town. The project is focused on urban food security and HIV/AIDS, and followed on from a proposal development workshop funded by CFP/IDRC (102012) in 2004. Although Dr. Hovorka is not the principle coordinator, she plans to investigate whether the project could be helpfully showcased at Nanjing.

Suggestions for IDRC

The session leaders made the following suggestions for IDRC’s participation in Nanjing, bearing in mind that the Centre’s engagement in WUF 4 will be more modest than its involvement in the Vancouver Forum:

- **IDRC gained extensive experience on navigating UN-Habitat channels through its involvement in WUF 3**. This experience could be used at WUF 4 to benefit IDRC’s partners, if **experienced IDRC staff are made available for advice/input**. Interviewees recommended that IDRC become involved in a **WUF 4 organizing or coordinating committee**, in addition to its role as a funding agency.
- Interviewees indicated that IDRC has an important leadership role to play at WUF, given its commitment to convening multi-stakeholder processes. While these values

could potentially be communicated by providing strategic support to multi-stakeholder events, participants suggested that **IDRC should ensure that it retains and even expands its influential role at WUF**. As one interviewee argued, the IDRC “brand” is well respected owing to the Centre’s political objectivity and technical expertise. IDRC can therefore make an important contribution to increasing the profile of key urban issues and researchers’ contributions. (However, another interviewee warned that **too much focus on IDRC “branding” can detract attention from partners’ research work**.)

- At WUF 3, IDRC placed high value on facilitating networking opportunities. For example, IDRC facilitated access to international networking opportunities for small municipalities whose learning opportunities otherwise remain largely locally confined. This **support for networking should remain a major feature of IDRC’s involvement** in WUF 4.
- It was an excellent opportunity to have IDRC support an event at the Earth Festival (public event parallel to the formal WUF program). The Earth Festival in Vancouver provided the **opportunity to expand IDRC’s exposure to a diverse, young audience**. Similar venues could also prove to be rewarding at WUF 4.
- In terms of UA, **IDRC could help ensure UA is incorporated into events on broader themes** such as slum upgrading, youth issues, etc. IDRC could also play an important function by **co-convening UA-specific activities such as a donor roundtable that would aim to diversify the donor base for UA**, which is still too dependent on IDRC and DGIS. The roundtable could explore how UA could fit into other donors’ programming, through themes such as youth, slum upgrading, local achievement of the MDGs, etc.
- **IDRC could support plans to organize a UA tour of Nanjing at WUF 4** (similar to the Vancouver UA tour), through the Chinese National Association on UA (the RUAF focal point for China is vice chair of this association). This tour could increase the impact/influence of WUF on local UA policies.
- **Support UA practitioners’ workshops** at WUF 4.
- **Support electronic conferences before and after WUF 4**. The electronic conferences would not be intended primarily for IDRC’s partners/organizers, but to bring in a larger/broader audience.

Annex 1: WUF Tracer Study Interview Questions

Impact of WUF 3

- Have you been able to follow up and build on any of the contacts you made in Vancouver? Do you know if any of the participants in your networking event have been successful in developing the contacts they made at WUF?
- Six months on from WUF 3, would you say that your participation in the Forum created any new opportunities for you or your organization? Do you know if participation in the Forum created any new opportunities for the speakers involved in your networking event?
- Has your participation in the World Urban Forum in Vancouver resulted in the development of any new partnerships, programs or research work?

Looking towards WUF 4

- Do you hope to participate in the 2008 World Urban Forum in Nanjing? If yes, in what way would you like to participate?
- In retrospect, how useful were the planning and preparatory activities that IDRC supported in advance of WUF 3? What was the most important aspect of the preparatory work?
- IDRC's engagement in WUF 4 will be considerably more modest than its participation in WUF 3. Bearing this in mind, what role would you like to see IDRC play at WUF 4? How should IDRC go about playing this role?

Annex 2: Notes from WUF tracer study interviews

All interviews were carried out by Luc Mougeot, with notes taken by Megan Bradley, (except for José Ballesteros—interviewing and notes by Luc Mougeot).

Henk de Zeeuw, 31 January 2007, 9:00 AM

*See information submitted by Henk de Zeeuw prior to interview.

Impact of WUF 3, and update on post-WUF 3 activities

1.1 Contacts and partnerships developed following WUF 3

- ETC/RUAF are developing more in-depth relationships with several contacts made at WUF 3. For example, RUAF is involved in ongoing discussions with Heifer Project in Washington, DC on their programme in USA (NB: RUAF also came into contact with Heifer through another channel, which led to RUAF being engaged to evaluate Heifer's programme in USA and Canada). It has been interesting for RUAF to learn more about Northern (US) experiences, and for Heifer Project to learn more about RUAF/experiences in Europe and the South. Contacts are also being developed between Heifer Project International and RUAF partners in Bulawayo and with Heifer Project in the Netherlands on projects in Holland. RUAF's discussions with Heifer Project International are in the early stages, but there is good potential for productive cooperation. RUAF is also engaged in information exchange with the City of Montreal, the McGill Edible Landscapes team, and with the Environmental Youth Alliance (EYA). The conversations with EYA have focused on urban agriculture and youth. It has been highly useful for RUAF to learn more about Northern experiences in this respect; for example, the experiences of Toronto and Vancouver with urban food policy analysis and planning are very useful methodologically. McGill and RUAF have contributed to the development of a proposal which was recently submitted to the EU for funding. (Marielle Dubbeling was the main RUAF contact on this, and can provide more information.)
- Participating at WUF 3 enabled RUAF to renew its working relations with Ryerson University (jointly involved in the development of a distance learning course on UA), and City Farmer (mutual information exchange and promotion on CF and RUAF web sites).

1.2 WUF 3 panellists' institutional development

- George Matovu's NGO has received more attention from international NGOs since he participated in the WUF. (But it is difficult to determine if this is directly connected to his participation in WUF)

1.3 WUF 3 panellists' personal development

- Gayathri Devi is now working on her PhD on UA issues in Australia. Professor Liu (RUAF partner from China) was one of seven researchers selected in a worldwide competition for a post-doctoral program in the UA. His involvement in RUAF supported his application.

Looking towards WUF 4

2.1 Clarification

- Henk clarified the comment in his written submission that “with 30% of that amount [IDRC’s investment in WUF 3] we can do wonders at WUF 4”. He meant that RUAF/ETC has achieved strong results at similar international conferences with only a fraction of the funding that IDRC channeled into WUF 3. However, he recognized that the results of ETC’s work in terms of institutional developments were perhaps not the same.

2.2 General ideas for WUF 4

- Electronic conferences would be a good idea (before and after WUF 4). The electronic conferences would not be intended primarily for IDRC’s partners/organizers, but to bring in a larger/broader audience.
- Mayors’ Panel
- Practitioners’ workshops
- Organising committee involving IDRC, FAO, CGIAR, and the RUAF Foundation, among others

2.3 Reflections on the WUF 3 planning process, and suggestions for WUF 4 preparations

- The initial planning meeting in Toronto was a disappointment, as it was primarily a brainstorming event, which did not sufficiently benefit from organization or follow-up. The information RUAF and others had prepared in advance was not used, and the ideas RUAF and others voiced were not used. Henk had the impression that the workshop was going to be a participatory process, but IDRC really led the process. However, the workshop could have been useful as a starting point. The real difficulty was that there were different objectives amongst the participants (showcasing IDRC’s work, vs. content-oriented objectives aimed at getting UA onto the political agenda.) RUAF may take a more active/directive approach to its own engagement in WUF 4.

2.4 IDRC’s role at WUF 4

- IDRC gained extensive organizing experience at many different levels through its involvement in WUF 3. This experience could be used at WUF 4 to benefit IDRC’s partners, if experienced IDRC staff are made available for advice/input. Henk would like to see IDRC involved in a WUF 4 organizing committee, in addition to its role as a funding agency.

2.5 RUAF’s role at WUF 4

- RUAF may use WUF 4 as a “showcasing” opportunity, depending on how the current phase of the RUAF project wraps up. RUAF’s Chinese partners are very interested to make a very strong case at Nanjing (NB: The definition of UA in China in general is somewhat different than RUAF’s, as it usually focuses on high-tech agriculture and larger scale agro-tourism, i.e. agro-parks.)

Alice Hovorka, 31 January 2007, 10:00 AM

Impact of WUF 3, and update on post-WUF 3 activities

1.1 Contacts and partnerships developed following WUF 3

- WUF 3 provided a worthwhile opportunity to develop new contacts. Important contacts were developed not so much through the session at the Earth Festival, as through participation in the broader range of WUF events.
- At WUF, members of the International Women's Rights Project at UBC approached Alice. Through ensuing discussions, they agreed to collaborate with one of Alice's MA students working on urban violence in Botswana.
- Students who attended the networking session Alice led at the Earth Festival have since approached Alice looking for information on UA in general, and on Alice's research. A new student approach Alice to express interest in working in one of her projects in Botswana/Southern Africa.

1.2 *Professional development and participation in WUF 3*

- WUF was an exceptional professional development experience, particularly in terms of building capacity to put together and lead a team. The opportunity to gain exposure in a public, multi-stakeholder (rather than strictly academic) forum was highly valuable.
- Alice emailed her panellists to ask for an update on their activities, but has not heard back from them yet. The group is putting together a UPE report/publication, based on their panel. Ongoing contact with the panellists has largely related to this project, although the group has some "editing fatigue" due to the long editing process that preceded the Earth Festival panel.

1.3 *Institutional development and participation in WUF 3*

- The University of Guelph is committed "on paper" to internationalism, ie. to trying to build its international stature, through participation in international forums, etc. Alice's involvement in WUF was supportive of this goal. WUF 3 was not specifically on Guelph's radar, although Alice brought the Forum and her participation to the attention of the University's media office and international program centre, etc. Alice has not heard any plans discussed regarding WUF 4, and suggested that the University's engagement in WUF may largely come down to her pushing on this issue from inside the institution. She has not yet met with success in linking with other urban experts at Guelph on the WUF, but is considering encouraging the University to engage in WUF 4. If universities want to bridge theory/practice gap and have an action-oriented focus, then WUF is a great venue in which to pursue these goals. WUF took the positive step of establishing a research forum; now the universities need to step up to the plate.

Looking towards WUF 4

2.1 *Reflections on venues at WUF*

- It was an excellent opportunity to have IDRC support an event at the Earth Festival (public event parallel to the formal WUF program). The Earth Festival provided the opportunity to expand IDRC's exposure to a diverse, young audience. The IDRC-supported networking event set a high standard for events at the Earth Festival, and addressed the challenge of bridging research and action/theory and practice.

2.2 *Participation in WUF 4*

- Alice is involved in a CIDA Tier 1 grant (3 m CAD over 5 years) related to capacity building and training — she is part of a large collaborative team involving 5 Canadian

and 9 Southern African universities, led by Queens and Cape Town universities. The project followed on from a proposal development workshop funded by CFP/IDRC (102012) in 2004. It is focused on urban food security and HIV/AIDS. Alice is not the principle coordinator, but is curious about whether it could be showcased at Nanjing.

2.3 Reflections on the WUF 3 planning process, and suggestions for WUF 4 preparations

- The planning process was extremely useful. Alice was impressed by how seriously IDRC took its involvement in WUF. The training was invaluable, as it helped focus session leaders and speakers, and enabled IDRC to advance its agenda and key messages, along with those of the individual participants on each panel. Convening the planning session early, and proceeding in a focused, rigorous manner was essential. Creating a “united front” in terms of the sessions’ messages was also key.
- Alice would recommend using the same approach again for WUF 4, particularly the use of “dry runs”. However, Alice’s session involved extensive revision re-planning as the venues changed. This was demanding and tedious for the speakers, as the value added was limited in the editing stages. This could have been avoided if the speakers had been asked to only prepare a presentation in advance of the Montreal workshop, rather than a paper and a presentation. The presentations could have been revised without too much trouble, and the papers could have been prepared on the basis of the presentations. This would have saved time and energy.
- Throughout the planning process, it is essential to keep the audience in mind. “Challenges” could have been highlighted more in the presentations, depending on what is chosen as the entry point/key messages.

2.4 IDRC’s role at WUF 4

- IDRC has a major role to play in the development community as a whole, beyond simply providing funding. IDRC’s active presence in the WUF is important (whether as a co-organizer, chair, speaker, etc.) so that the valuable work IDRC does is communicated. IDRC can play a particularly important leadership role, because the organization is committed to many positive values that need to be communicated to the international community, e.g. focus on multi stakeholder approaches, networking. The importance IDRC places on multi-stakeholder processes could potentially be conveyed just by funding multi-stakeholder sessions, but Alice is not entirely sure. IDRC is an influential organization, and could be more so.

Jose Ballesteros, 31 January 2007, 3:00 PM (notes taken in Spanish by Luc Mougeot)

Impact of WUF 3, and update on post-WUF 3 activities

1.1 Follow-up

Personal enrichment at two levels:

- Pre-panel dry run in Vancouver was very valuable (further comments from IDRC staff and consultants on how to handle interaction with the public). However, José found too much time elapsed between the Montreal training workshop and the Vancouver dry run; still, when considering other options, I find it difficult to suggest any better way (no easy solution).

- Discussing with other IDRC participants on urban agriculture panels (namely, Marielle Dubbeling), in particular the role of UA in risk reduction (see next point).

Strengthening the capacity of my own organization:

- José has taken steps to incorporate UA as a risk management strategy in national policy on delivery of public services. In Colombia's Department of Environment /Land Development Branch, his team has commissioned a consultancy (Omar Dario and Gustavo Wilches both from IDRC-supported LA RED network) which explores the use of UA as a land use for high risk areas, particularly those from which populations need to be re-settled. A pilot project is scheduled for 2007 in Manizales.

1.2 New Opportunities

- Collaboration with panellists: a month and a half ago, José attended an IDRC-supported meeting in Panama which gathered several experts on risk. This discussed among others, two case studies featured by my panel at WUF. Discussions are underway with no specific follow-up defined so far.

1.3 New partnerships

- Currently efforts of José and his colleagues are focused on helping the Department of Environment to internally reach a position on how best integrate risk management in public service delivery (namely water supply and sanitation, including water table and groundwater bodies). This needs to be done before and in order for us to approach others for serious collaboration.

Looking towards WUF 4

2.1 José said he would like to attend, as long as he could present his country's own experience and learn from other relevant experiences. An approach which he and his colleagues are examining, in Colombia, is to incorporate risk management in public service delivery through decentralizing infrastructure and management at the departmental level, with the participation of the private sector - given that a large number of municipalities are ill-equipped to do so.

2.2 IDRC played a very important role at WUF 3 as it had the know-how to identify actors and the stature to convene them at the same table. It facilitated access to international networking for small municipalities whose learning opportunities otherwise remain largely confined to their local universe.

2.3 In the future and as regards the experience of his own panel, José thinks panels should be led by someone with deep knowledge of the case studies to be discussed on the panel, so as to reach the audience with stronger messages than he was able to convey.

IDRC's convening power, which facilitates the networking of different actors from different parts of the world, should again be put to use for WUF 4.

Marielle Dubbelling, 2 February 2007, 11:00 AM

Impact of WUF 3, and update on post-WUF 3 activities

1.1 General reflections on WUF 3

- The question of attribution is difficult—it is hard to say for sure that a particular development occurred as a result of an organization or city's participation in WUF. However, for the cities that participated in the panel Marielle convened (Rosario, Beijing and Vancouver), WUF served to reaffirm their UA strategy, and gave a political boost for further work. Wendy Mendes reported to Marielle that when Peter Ladner opened a recent conference on food security, he mentioned Vancouver's participation in the WUF. This shows that cities are proud to have been selected to showcase their experiences at the WUF. The interest in UA generated by the Forum demonstrated to the participating cities that they are at the head of the pack. Given the limited record of local government involvement in UA, WUF had an important function in terms of affirming the value of this work.

1.2 Contacts and partnerships developed following WUF 3

- ETC is building a relationship with the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM). They are discussing the possibility of co-organizing project in the Great Lakes region (DRC, Rwanda, Burundi), which the FCM can hopefully support financially. The project will address a range of themes including food security, income generation and the reintegration of displaced groups in post-conflict contexts (focusing on at-risk groups including youth, female-headed households, widows, people with HIV/AIDS, etc.) The project will build on some programs that are already in place in the DRC, such as a stakeholder forum. RUAF is hoping to bring the cities together, and help them draft a regional program. In one or two years, they will hopefully join the RUAF network. Through contacts with FCM, ETC/RUAF hopes to be able to invite Canadian city representatives to a workshop on UA in the Great Lakes region, with the goal of promoting exchange of experience between regions. For example, Vancouver would contribute its vision of sustainably integrating UA into urban policy. Montreal could share its experiences with urban gardens. Rosario could discuss its consumer approach.
- One of the ETC/RUAF team members (Marije Pouw) did a study tour after WUF, in Vancouver and NYC. This helped strengthen contacts with North American cities and partners. Through these contacts, ETC/RUAF is trying to systematize North American experiences with UA on all levels, and on specific themes, e.g. youth involvement in UA. This information will be used in RUAF trainings, and will hopefully serve as the basis of future exchanges, like that being planned for the Great Lakes region. RUAF also hopes to carry out a larger project on the inclusion of youth in UA. (Youth issues could be an important entry point for future WUFs.)
- Aside from institutional/organizational developments, ETC/RUAF is also developing relations with individuals they met at WUF. Developments include further exchanges

with Wendy Mendes, further discussions between Rosario and Vancouver, involvement in Local Agenda 21 program in francophone Africa (developing technical manuals on LA21), etc. These developments are less concrete than those discussed above.

Looking towards WUF 4

2.1 ETC/RUAF's interest in WUF 4

- ETC/RUAF wants to continue pursuing UA on the WUF agenda. At Nanjing, it would be helpful to continue showcasing UA, but also to incorporate UA into events (networking sessions, dialogues, etc.) on other, broader themes such as slum upgrading, youth issues, etc. There is still value in organizing UA-specific activities such as a donor roundtable that would aim to diversify the donor base for UA (still too dependent on IDRC and DGIS). The roundtable could explore how UA could fit into other donors' programming, through themes such as youth, slum upgrading, local achievement of the MDGs, etc.

2.2 Reflections on the WUF 3 planning process, and suggestions for WUF 4 preparations

- Two aspects of the preparatory work were particularly important: (i) the development of strong relationships between the cities. This would not have happened without an intensive planning process. All four cities that were involved in the preparatory process have taken aspects of the other cities' work, and are incorporating these into their own programs. (e.g. all of the cities are trying to strengthen the involvement of private enterprise in UA). This cross-fertilization would not have happened if the city representatives had only met once, in Vancouver. (ii) improved individual capacity to prepare and give presentations. The improvement is still evident in those panellists who have given presentations after WUF. The practice of using video critiques has been taken up by RUAF members responsible for running "training trainers" workshops.
- The Montreal workshop was too early to expect people to have final presentations prepared (it took place 8 months before WUF, and people wanted to include information on recent developments in their presentations). However, the timing is less relevant in terms of the capacity building work.

2.3 IDRC's role at WUF 4

- Would like IDRC to be part of coordinating committee with other partners such as RUAF, Urban Harvest, etc. This would be helpful because IDRC has gone through the process of lobbying with Habitat, and can share ideas and experiences on how to best pursue this. If a donor forum is put together, IDRC could play a valuable role as a co-convenor along with DGIS in raising the issue with other donors.
- A Chinese National Association on UA was formed, with approx. 200 Chinese cities and organizations. The RUAF focal point for China is vice chair of this association. He would like to organize a study tour on UA through this Chinese association. ETC/RUAF will discuss this with him in Lima—it is unclear if Nanjing is part of the association, but Marielle will encourage the RUAF focal point to invite the Mayor of Nanjing to join the association. As in Vancouver, a

tour of UA in Nanjing could be organized (with the assistance of the Chinese National Association on UA), which could increase the impact/influence of WUF on local UA policies. IDRC could help push for this, thereby maximizing the utility of WUF being held in China.

Eduardo Passalacqua, 2 February 2007, 1:00 PM

*See information submitted by Eduardo Passalacqua prior to interview.

Impact of WUF 3, and update on post-WUF 3 activities

1.1 General

- Argentina had approximately 12 delegates at WUF 3, compared to Brazil's delegation of 30 people. Given the sense of competition between the two countries, Eduardo anticipates that Argentina will send a larger delegation to WUF 4.

1.2 Activities following WUF 3

- Eduardo has given a number of presentations/papers about WUF. Politically, the most important audience he has had is the Ways and Means Committee of the Legislature of Buenos Aires. He found that although various committee members were former Buenos Aires council representatives, they were not necessarily thoroughly informed about WUF and contemporary urban challenges. He therefore provided background on the event, and explained that the Vancouver Forum underlined that in many countries, urban planning is not the sole responsibility of architects (as it is in Argentina). The committee members found this very interesting, and Eduardo passed on information and contact details he gathered in Vancouver for the committee members to follow up. In his presentations, Eduardo emphasized that although the Forum did not result in a "cure all" for the challenges facing cities in the North and South, the WUF did create a sense of community between Northern and Southern cities that goes beyond paying lip service to the idea that we all need to work together.
- WUF underlined the need to create different kinds of alliances and partnerships, including between the public and private sector—importance of networking. Eduardo has kept in touch with many people he met at WUF, and has been commissioned to prepare some papers following the Forum. For him, the contacts he made were the most important result of the Forum. He has spoken with participants from Rosario about this, and they share the same view.
- In the context of Eduardo's post-WUF activities, he distributed reference CD s from the Global Urban Observatory to legislators. Various legislators have installed it on their computers, and use it to make more references in their work to the approaches taken by legislators working in other places.
- Word of mouth plays an important role in spreading the news about WUF and efforts in the field of urban development. For example, the fact that IDRC is funding a project in Moreno is circulating amongst mayors, etc., and this strengthens the view that cities should try to cooperate more with the North. IDRC's work is gaining increased attention in Latin America, and is widely respected due to its "politics and technical expertise".

1.3 *Partnerships development following WUF 3*

- No concrete partnerships have emerged in the sense of formalized relationships—but Eduardo has talked with several people, and has benefited from more frequent communications with them. This is also true of the panellists from Eduardo’s networking session. The mayor of Sao Paulo is now a main stakeholder in a regional urban network (this is not just because of WUF). For Alberto Kleinman, Vancouver provided a push for him to increase his participation in the Mercociudades network.

Looking toward WUF 4

2.1 *IDRC’s role at WUF 4*

- Eduardo underlined his view that the IDRC “brand” can make an important contribution to increasing the profile of key urban issues and researchers’ contributions. IDRC can also serve as a link between different organizations at different levels, for example between different local governments in the region. Efforts need to be made to learn from mistakes and failures.
- Eduardo can put IDRC in contact with various local organizations to further disseminate IDRC-supported work.

2.2 *Reflections on the WUF 3 planning process, and suggestions for WUF 4 preparations*

- IDRC’s program worked like clockwork in Vancouver. IDRC did an excellent job in managing people from all over the world “with big egos”—this view was shared by the participants in Eduardo’s panel. IDRC’s efforts meant that problems were resolved before they arose, thanks to a young staff with intelligent and gentle ways.
- An important aspect of the preparations was that the checklist provided for the presentations themselves, a process which forced the Latin American participants to summarize and emphasize their key points, so they could avoid running on in their presentations. This was a very important contribution, which is why some people got mad about it! It is essential that the preparation process helps people get to the point, and talk about realities.
- The preparatory process also resulted in important outcomes in terms of form—the panellists made major progress in their speaking abilities, learned to stick to a checklist for presentations, and dealt with problems such as stage fright.